

THE GOSPEL
OF THE
TYPICAL SERVITUDE:

THE SUBSTANCE OF A SERMON PREACHED IN GREENFIELD, JAN. 1, 1834

BY SAMUEL CROTHERS,
Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, in Greenfield, Ohio.

PUBLISHED BY THE ABOLITION SOCIETY OF PAINT VALLEY.

HAMILTON, O.

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE INTELLIGENCER.

BY GARDNER & GIBBON.

1835.

If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve thee; and in the 7th year he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free; then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him unto the door, or unto the door post: and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him forever. Exodus 21. 2, 6:

The Koran, which Mahomet gave his followers abounds with immoralities and palpable contradictions. They account for it by saying that their prophet recorded his revelations just as they were brought to him by the angel Gabriel, that they were imparted to him at different times, during the course of twenty three years; and that in the intervals, the Almighty so frequently changed his mind, that one revelation contradicts another. This convenient story is perfectly satisfactory to Musselmen. But all christendom consider it sufficient grounds for pronouncing their prophet, before heaven and earth, a convicted imposter.

It is mortifying to be told that in the Christian church there are thousands, including some of our most distinguished theologians, who give no better account of the word of God. They assert that principles and practices are inculcated in the old Testament which are at war with the morality of the new. They contend, particularly, that the law of Moses licensed a system of servitude opposed to the requirements of the moral law, and inconsistent with the heavenly spirit of the Gospel. And they apologise for it by saying that Moses and the Apostles were inspired under different dispensations!! It was the utterance of a sentiment not more revolting to a pious mind, which moved Hezekiah to send to Isaiah the son of Amos, a deputation of the Elders of Israel clothed in sackcloth, saying *this is a day of trouble and of rebuke and of blasphemy.*

Apart from all concern for the enslaved African, the emancipation of our churches from the dominion of the slave holding spirit is a matter of unspeakable importance. If we do not wish to see the rising generation grow up a race of infidels, their minds, must be disabused in regard to this matter. We must shew them that those passages which have been quoted as proofs that the morality of the bible is corrupt, and contradictory, have been grossly misunderstood. They must see that in every page of his word, God shines forth in the same glorious character; and that in every age of the world he has required of his people substantially the same faith, and the same holiness.

We have another inducement to study diligently the law of Moses. The writers of the New Testament direct all their readers to that law for clear and comprehensive views of the terms by which they express the offices, and blessings of Messiah. They tell us that he is—our master—our advocate with the father—our Redeemer—our great

High Priest; the propitiation for our sins; our Passover; the Lamb of God. They never define these terms. They professedly use them in relation to the Sinai covenant, as terms which had been used and understood by God's people from the beginning; they would have all Christians to study them in the light of the Old Testament. The titles *master* and *servant* are used with remarkable frequency, to express the relations existing between Christ and his followers. They are employed as among the most endearing appellations. The notion has been popular ever since the commencement of the slave trade, that these terms are used in allusion to misters and servants in Greece and Rome, and that therefore their meaning must be fixed by pagan writers. Is it indeed true that when brethren differ as to the precise meaning of any of the titles of their Saviour, they must call in some polished pagan to sit as umpire? Can you make a plain sensible Christian believe that to understand the preaching of our Lord and his Apostles he must employ as interpreter some heathen who had spent his life in worshipping the Devil, and never had one gospel idea himself, and whose only redeeming quality perhaps, was a taste for classical Greek? What aid is to be expected from men who never saw a master who was not a tyrant, nor a servant who was not an oppressed slave? It is a historical fact that Augustus and Tiberius refused the title *master*, because it was the name of a slave-holder. They considered it an insult to be called by a name which designated tyrants. And, would it honor our glorious master in heaven to tell our children that he is the antitype of those who as masters were despots, and as men were proverbially sensual and devilish? The Apostles never slander a follower of Jesus, nor outrage his feelings, by applying to him the distinctive title of a slave-holder. When they passed the bounds of the holy land to preach the gospel in regions where the law of Moses had no influence, they met with slaveholders. But, although the fact does not appear from our translation, it is evident to every attentive reader of the original, that they never call them by the name (*kurios*) which distinguished such a master as the Jewish law approved. They call them (*Despotes*) despots, i. e. men who claim a power over their fellow men which belongs to none but the Almighty.. 1. Tim. 6, 1, 2, Tit. 2, 1, 2. In a similar way they expose to public infamy the great patron of African slavery—by holding up to the view of the church and the world, his picture, as *sitting in the temple of God, showing himself as God*. They never address the despots as believers or recognise them as members of the Church. They treat them as wicked men. When the Apostle James, (chap. 5. 1, 15) addresses those who were living in the slave-holder's sin—*keeping back by fraud the hire of their laborers*—he seems to be speaking to men at a distance, whom it was scarcely safe to approach. It reminds us of David's address to Abner, the Captain of Saul's host, at midnight—*from the top of a hill afar off, a great space being between them*.*

* In 1. Tim. 6, 2, the phrase *believing despots*, (masters) is used in reference to the moment of their conversion to express at once their past and present character. Some infer that they continued despots. But James tells us how *Rahab the harlot*, was justified. Did she continue a harlot?

It is in allusion to the typical servitude of the law of Moses that Jesus Christ is called our master and we his servants. We must therefore understand these statutes which regulated masters and servants under that law, if we would have clear views of our relation and obligation to our Saviour.

If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve thee, and in the seventh year he shall go out free for nothing. In Deut. 15. 13, 14, we have this: *When thou sendest him out from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty, thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy wine press.*

On comparing this statute with that which regulated the Jubilee, (Lev. 25. 39, 40,) we are met with an apparent difficulty. Here, they were authorised to compel a bought Hebrew to serve till the seventh year. There a brother who had waxed poor and been sold, could not become a servant at all, except in a qualified sense; and under various restrictions—*thou shalt not compel him to serve as a servant* (improperly translated *bond-servant*;) *but as a hired servant and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of Jubilee.* But we have only to recollect that the one statute regulates the case of the first born, the landlords in Israel; the other, that of the younger brethren. The former, in addition to a double portion of the goods, were the sole inheritors of the soil; while the latter filled the other departments in society, and could own houses and other property in walled cities. From the first promise of a Saviour, the oldest son was the landlord and husbandman; and excepting in case of deposition, or forfeiture of the birth-right, the younger brethren only could be servants. All who are acquainted with the allusions to this arrangement both in the old and new testament, know that it was typical.—It made the first-born the type of him who is called *our elder brother—our kinsman or redeemer—the heir of all things—the first born of every creature—the first born among many brethren; the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence.*

Cain was the tiller of the ground, and had a pre-eminence over his brother, the continuance of which is promised as an inducement to do well—*unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.* But when Cain became an irreclaimable heretic, perseveringly rejecting the atonement every time he worshipped, and at length crowned his wickedness with the crime of murder, God deposed him. He was told that he should no longer live as the husbandman or lord of the soil. “When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield her strength, a fugitive, and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.”

Isaac was the sole heir of the promised land. To prevent any collision which might grow out of the envy and ambition of his younger brethren, Abraham, *while he yet lived*, gave them the portions of younger sons, and sent them away.

The lordship over the soil, was one of the privileges connected with the birth right which Esau profanely sold for a mess of pottage. When God predicted to Rebekah, before the children were born, that the younger should have the birth right, he said: “The elder shall serve the younger.” When his father instals him in the birth right he says:

"God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine, let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee; be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee." And when he informs Esau of what had been done he says: "Behold I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given to him for servants, and with corn and wine have I sustained him."

The Sinai covenant embodies every article of faith, and every typical institution incorporated with the religion of the patriarchs. We find in that covenant no repeal of the birth-right but many arrangements and allusions which imply its continuance. When the holy land was divided by lot among the sons of Jacob, the first born saved from destruction in Egypt by the blood of the paschal lamb were the sole heritors of the soil. The supposition that so small a territory was parceled out equally among the millions who passed over Jordan, and subsequently divided among their numerous descendents, would reduce it to a great number of little garden spots. There could be no such thing as farming excepting on a very unprofitable and contemptible scale — no such thing as fields and vineyards, and olive yards. The law of the Jubilee (Lev. 25.) is predicated on the continuance of the birth-right privileges. The elder sons are the land-holders, they can, at any time, redeem their inheritances, or, at farthest, take possession of them in the year of jubilee; and under no adversity can they be compelled to serve as bondmen or servants.

In the statute before us the master and servant are supposed to have been related to each other as elder and younger brethren. The servant has no land possession to return to in the seventh year. It is evident he never had any, from the fact that he could, when sold, be compelled to serve as a servant for a definite number of years. But the master has his farm and threshing floor, his vineyard and wine press, and his flocks and herds. Hence he can give his servant, in the year of freedom a liberal supply of corn, and wine and cattle. The master and servants here, are those who by the divine law were constituted types of Jesus Christ and his servants.

The master under this typical dispensation was one of the first born in Israel who found a younger brother poor and in debt. He had compassion on him, and extricated him from his difficulties by buying him. (in the scriptural sense of the word) i. e. by paying such a sum of money as would secure his services for six years. He took him into his house and engaged to protect, and feed, and clothe him until the seventh year. In the meantime the man thus relieved was bound to labor in promoting the wealth and honor and prosperity of his master's house.

Thus the church and the world were taught that the servants of Jesus Christ were generally *wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked*. The divine law had claims against them which they had no resources to meet. But Jesus saw their perishing condition, and had compassion on them. By taking their nature into union with his own, he became their kinsman, their elder brother. By laying down his own life, he satisfied the claims of law and justice, and ransomed them from destruction. By the calls of his gospel and other

means he persuaded them to take refuge in his house. He instructs them by his word and spirit, and clothes them with his righteousness, and feeds them with the bread of life, and protects them from all their enemies. Hence the disciples loved to call Jesus *master*. They gloried in the title, *servants of Jesus Christ*. They would not have exchanged it for that of Cæsar. It humbled them, and cheered them, and kept alive in their hearts a sense of their obligations to the Saviour who had done so great things for them. *Master and servant* in the typical law mean all that is comprehended in *saviour and saved sinner*.

It is worthy of particular notice that the servant under this statute must be a *Hebrew*—a Hebrew man or a Hebrew woman, Deut. 15, 12—a *Hebrew or Hebrewess*, Jer. 34. 9. The term *Hebrews* includes two classes viz: the lineal descendants of Abraham, and those from other nations who *entered into the congregation*, and were entitled to all the privileges enjoyed by other members, including marriage and enrolment with the descendants of Abraham. Hence the distinction between a *Hebrew* and a *Hebrew of the Hebrews*, an *Israelite* and an *Israelite of the seed of Abraham*. There were other pious proselytes who could not enter into the Congregation, of course could not marry a Hebrew. These might become servants, but their term of service was different, and they were regulated by a different statute, Lev. 25, 39, 47. But every Hebrew who felt himself poor enough to be bought by his elder brother, might be a servant till the seventh year.—Thus an answer is furnished to the important inquiry—who is Jesus Christ able and willing to save? Or, who may be his servants? Not the righteous. If you are not deeply in debt to the law of God—if you can get along without him, you do not need a saviour. He came not to call the righteous, but sinners. He cannot save fallen angels; he has made no provision for them. But if you wear the nature which the son of God assumed, *that he might be the first born among many brethren*—if you are a sinful child of Adam, you may be a servant of Jesus Christ, and all that is wanting, is your cordial consent.

This sale was voluntary.

The servant sold himself, as the Egyptians did, who came to Joseph pleading that he would buy them for servants, and thus save them from perishing with hunger. The notion that the rich Hebrews were authorized to make merchandize of their poor brethren, and sell them by force as they did their cattle, speaks for itself. It would make the holy land the worst region on which the sun has ever shone. With all the wickedness of this world, it is questionable whether a country has ever been found where the laws of the land gave a sweeping permission to the rich to sell the poor. It is otherwise even among those wretched hordes in Africa, who for three hundred years have been waging incessant warfare with their neighbors, for the purpose of supplying the demand among christians for stolen men. To sell one of their own tribe who has not forfeited his liberty by crime, is a sin punished with death.

We must keep out of view the prevailing system of slavery in our own land. It is difficult to look at it without having our minds pol-

luted, and unfitted for the study of the scriptures. We must interpret the phrase—if *thou buy a Hebrew*—according to the same principles which guide us in the interpretation of similar phrases.—*If thou buy a field, &c.* Of whom could it be bought but its owner?—When Jacob heard that there was corn in Egypt, he said to his sons, *go buy us a little food.* Happily our minds have never been defiled by a legalized system of corn stealing, or trading in stolen corn. It never enters any man's head that the patriarch wished his sons to trade with thieves. And whom has God constituted the rightful owner of a man's hands and feet? Were our fathers a set of political hypocrites when they claimed their freedom on the broad principle that *all men are created free and equal?*

Admit that the servitude here legalized was involuntary and it follows that this typical statute was intended to hold up to view the worst of heresies. If the typical servant was a slave so is the servant of Jesus Christ. Of course a man may be a saved sinner, and be going to heaven whether he will or not, who never loved the Lord Jesus Christ never felt his need of him, never wished to have any thing to do with him, but always hated both his employment and his laws. It must soothe the guilty soul of a slave trader when marching at the head of some hundreds of his fellow beings chained together for a distant market, if he can succeed in believing that he is exhibiting to the world a fine typical illustration of the manner in which the Son of God takes souls to heaven, and that the trade was invented at Mount Sinai for that very purpose. Adopt the slave holders interpretation of this statute; and the moment a man opens his mouth to swallow its instruction, the slave holder's poison, like the curse so fearfully described in the book of Psalms, *comes into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones.*

The servitude authorised by this statute was limited. "Six years shall he serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free."

In the law and the prophets, seven is the typical and perfect number. Every seventh day was a sabbath or rest. Every seventh month was distinguished for holy convocations and solemnities. Every seventh year was a sabbatical year, a year of resting from labor, and of releasing the poor from debts. Every seven times seven was the sabbath of the jubilee. All who have carefully noticed the allusions to these sabbaths by inspired men, know that they were typical of an eternal sabbath in heaven. We must not suppose that the year of freedom was the same to all servants, or the same with the sabbatical year. We have proof of the contrary in the fact that the year of freedom from servitude, and the sabbatical year are no where identified. The law respecting servants every where says expressly—*six years shall he serve*; and the directions respecting their freedom are no where incorporated with the regulations of the year of release from debts. It appears to be no more true that all servants were free in the same year, than that all servants of Jesus Christ are simultaneously released from their master's work by death and taken to heaven.

He shall go out free for nothing.

An inspired apostle says that the law given at Sinai was 'our school-master to bring us to Christ that we might be justified by faith—we

were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. One great design of it was to hedge up the Church on all sides, and keep her from the pathways of error. It is questionable whether the ingenuity of man can contrive a heresy plausible enough to disturb the peace of the Church, which is not guarded against by that law. Hence the sneering and opposition to the study of it by errorists of every name. If the new testament were universally studied in the light of the old, one half the heresies which are desolating some parts of Christendom, and much of the discrepancy of expression and sentiment which at this moment disturbs the harmony of brethren within our own borders, would perish in a night.

The notion of earning heaven by our own works is one of the prominent features of every false religion on earth; and the love of it is interwoven with our fallen nature. God frowned on this heresy, and proclaimed the opposite truth, by prohibiting any price from the servant as the purchase of his rest or freedom. *He shall go out free for nothing.* When his six years were expired his plea was this—"I was a poor man, unable to get along, but my elder brother pitied me; and by the payment of a sum of money delivered me from thralldom. He took me into his family, and fed, and clothed, and watched over me for six years. And it is the law written on the door post of his house that in the seventh year all his servants shall have their freedom for nothing." From the days of righteous Abel to the present hour, the servants of Jesus, whatever else they may have differed about have had the same hope, the same plea for heaven when they came to the close of life. "I am a sinner saved by grace; Jesus saw and pitied me when a rebel, an outcast perishing in my sins. He gave his life a ransom for me. He has clothed, and fed me, and corrected my wanderings and follies, and saved me out of the hands of all my enemies. And it is the law of his house that when his servants are dismissed from his work on earth, they shall be received to the enjoyment of rest in heaven. He asks no price; and it is well that it is so—"I am too poor to buy a place in heaven," still the saved sinner does expect a reward. The nature of it is illustrated by the command in Deuteronomy.

"When thou sendest him out free from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty; thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy wine press."

No amount is specified. It is not given as the earned wages; but as a gracious reward to express the benevolence of the master and to promote the temporal happiness of a poor brother. The amount, would, of course, depend on the estimate of his services. The primary design of this arrangement was to furnish a poor man with a stock to commence with when he received his freedom. But the ultimate object was to hold up clearly that doctrine so much perverted, yet so frequently inculcated in the scriptures, viz:—*the Lord Jesus will bestow on all his servants a reward, not of debt but of grace, proportioned to their services.* It is called the joy of their Lord; a crown of righteousness; a crown of rejoicing; a crown of life; a crown of glory. Our saviour tells us that when he shall sit on the throne of his glory, he shall say to them on his right hand, "I was a hungered and ye gave

me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me." This appears to be the only thing among the transactions of that day, which will occasion any thing like a blush among the redeemed. When they shall hear such mention of their poor services—so imperfect that they could hardly bear them themselves; they will exclaim as with one voice: "Lord when saw we thee a hungered and fed thee? Or thirsty and gave thee drink, &c? And the King shall answer and say unto them: verily I say unto you, in as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." An old testament prophet alluding to the rewards and punishments to be distributed on that dreadful glorious day, says: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

The care manifested in this statute, not to violate the ties by which the poor man is bound to his kindred, is worthy its origin. If any proof were wanting that the prevailing system of involuntary servitude originated in contempt of the authority of God, we have it in its utter disregard of the strongest and most tender ties. It separates the husband from his wife; and tears the little infant from the breast of its weeping mother, with as little remorse as is usually manifested in separating cattle from their kind. Let no one say this is one of the abuses of the system. It is one of its necessary results. No slave holder can prevent it, when his property becomes liable to execution, or when by his death, the slaves pass into the hands of his heirs. And every slave holder knows this, and every slave holder for the sake of gain, is acting the part of a deliberate villain. The statute before us breathes a different spirit.

"If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife; and she have borne him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's; and he shall go out by himself."

The master may have given him as a wife a female servant whose term commenced after his. In that case he cannot take his wife with him till she is free.

Again, we must beware of mental defilement by the sin of our land. We here notice the use made of this text, simply as a sample of the debanching influence of familiarity with any gross sin. The advocates for slaveholding insert the word *property*; *the wife and children shall be her master's property*. Then they hold up the text as most convincing proof of the lawfulness of making property of infants born of poor and defenceless females. And without remorse a Christian, and even Christian minister can step into the slaves' apartment, when he hears the cries of a new born infant, and doom it, and its posterity, through all generations to interminable slavery. A child born the property of a fellow worm!! A little infant forfeiting its unalienable rights, and entailing slavery on all its descendants down to the

sound of the last trumpet, simply, by being born, and because the manstealer had succeeded in rivetting chains on its mother!!! Our Lord says: *Why of your yourselves judge ye not what is right?* Why are all civilized nations rising up and declaring as one man, that those outlaws engaged in the slave trade shall die the death? That man must be hackneyed in deceit and expert at outwitting his conscience, who, while he admits that making property of human beings on the coast of Africa ought to be punished with death, contends for it as a christian employment on his own farm. We admit that one is a more hazardous employment than the other; and this is the sum of the difference. It requires courage to bolt into an African village at midnight and in the presence of those fierce warriors who sleep with their spears at their pillows, seize their little ones and drag them to the slave ship. But the most timid man can step into an out-cabin and in the presence of parents who are in chains seize their little infant as it sleeps in the cradle. Can a christian hesitate in pronouncing on such conduct? *Doth not nature itself teach you that it is a shame?* How different was the spirit of an African princess when she saw the infant of one of her father's slaves floating exposed on the river Nile. *She saw the child, and behold the babe wept, and she had compassion on it.* And what did she do with it? It seems she had the soul of a woman. She sent for a nurse and said: "Take this child away, and nurse it, and I will pay thee thy wages. As soon as it could be separated from the nurse's lap, she took it into her father's palace, and adopted it as her son, and educated him that he might one day sit on the throne of Egypt. By thus yielding to the dictates of a benevolent heart, she saved the life of one of the greatest and best of men; and qualified for future usefulness the typical saviour and lawgiver of Israel; the man who, centuries afterwards, was chosen in heaven, with Elias, to meet the son of God on the mount and talk with him *of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.* Why do not Christians and Christian Ministers manifest the same spirit towards the infants of slaves? Why—the Bible will not let them!! Sometimes the apology is; "we are so unfortunate that our circumstances will not permit us to abandon this unpleasant business." Or as it is sometimes, still more handsomely expressed; "slave holding is our misfortune, not our crime." By thus using the soft heathenish terms *misfortune* and *unfortunate*, they avoid shocking pious ears with the profanity of saying in plain terms, that God in his overruling providence compels them to live in a damning sin. We here simply remark that the man who is so unfortunate that he cannot cease from a known sin, is too unfortunate to be a Christian; and he must calculate on a great *run of good luck*, if he expects enough of it to take him to heaven in his wickedness.

The statute before us, in all its bearings, is wise, and merciful, and worthy of its author. It is implied that a female servant could be disposed of in marriage only by her master; that if she have children they must remain with her, under his care till she is free; and that she must not in any event, leave him till the term of service expires. In all this, it harmonises with the laws of Ohio and every free state where

the statute book has been framed in the light of the gospel. If young persons, among us, be in circumstances which make it needful or proper, our laws provide that they may be indentured to some one who will be to them a master in the good sense of the term. The indenture will call him master and them servants. It will expressly stipulate that they shall not marry nor contract marriage without his permission, during the term of service. And in every country where the gospel has its influence, the heart of a mother is not permitted to be broken, nor the soul of a child jeopardized, by their separation. The fruits of any other arrangement would be frightful. We all know how much the future welfare and character of a child depend on a mother's care. If any one will show it the path to heaven and caution it against those bye-ways which lead to ruin, surely its mother will. The French philosophers might have been successful in making France a great den of Atheists, had they, in addition to the abolition of the sabbath, succeeded in depriving mothers of the privilege of instructing their own children. Let us analyze this passage more particularly.

"A maid servant must not, in any event, leave her master before the term of service expired." If she were given in marriage to a fellow servant whose term commenced before hers, he will be free before her. But even for the sake of her husband, she must not defraud her master. The typical meaning of this is obvious from the frequent allusions to it in the new testament to illustrate this important truth, viz: *the claims of Jesus Christ on those servants whom he has bought with his blood, are paramount.* "Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men." Ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your bodies and spirits which are God's." The doctrine which the Saviour preached on this subject is plain and unequivocal. "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple." It is not the least evil of slavery that it has corrupted the theology and morals of the Church.—Slave holding Christians have been the first, and so far as we know, they are the only professed followers of Jesus who openly avow it, that the paramount considerations with a christian should be his ease, his property, his sa'ety and his life. In the same breath with which they acknowledge the injustice of holding a fellow man in bondage, they will apologise by gravely telling you that all their funds are invested in the bones and sinews of their fellow men, and emancipation would make them poor; or that regard for the safety of their lives justifies them in dying slave holders. According to their system there never ought to have been such a thing as dying or even suffering to avoid sin; according to them all the martyrs from the days of Abel to the present hour, died as the fool dieth. How differently the primitive christians viewed the matter. "With them, the man who dishonored God or injured his fellow to avoid sacrifice, was an apostate. No allurements or threats could turn them aside from owning and serving their Saviour. Their kindred might disown them; their enemies might take

from them all their goods; they might crucify them, burn them at the stake, or saw them asunder, but they could not desert their master's service till he released them by death. In this they were followers of him who when he became a servant *was obedient even unto death.*

"The release of the servant shall not impair the claims of the wife and children on their master."

In this were typified the claims of the widows of God's servants and the claims of children of the covenant, on the God of their fathers. In God's covenant with Abraham he engaged to be the God of believers and their seed. This promise secures to them all necessary temporal things, and the means of grace with, [of course] the offer of salvation through a Redeemer. Old testament saints seem to have clearly understood this principle—no event can impair the claims of a widow or orphan whose husband or father was a servant of God. We often hear them bringing forward their claims on God, as the children of his servants. And they do it in terms which have an evident allusion to this statute—*the wife and children shall be the master's.* Thus David prays: "O Lord I am thy servant; I am thy servant, the son of thine handmaid; Ps. 116.—16. "Thou art he who took me out of the womb; thou didst make me to hope when I was on my mother's breasts. I was cast upon thee from the womb, thou art my God from my mother's belly. Ps. 22—9, 1. When he was a feeble, old man, unable to help or protect himself, his enemies gathered round him and said; "God hath forsaken, persecute and take him; for there is none to deliver him." But he calls to the God of his mother and his plea is —"Thou art he that took me from my mother's bowels—thou art my trust from my youth—now also when I am old and grey headed, O God forsake me not. Ps. 71. We are thus taught the important truth already stated.

When the Lord Jesus releases a servant from his work and takes him to his rest, he will take care of his wife and children. The habitual belief of this would save christians, and christian ministers from many anxious hours and many temptations of the Devil. "What will become of my family when I am gone?"—is the cry of many worldly professors, and in many instances it is their apology for robbing God.—The tempter often whispers into the ear—"to provide for one's own is a christian duty; your devotedness to the master's work, will leave nothing to keep your family from beggary when you are dead." And he often succeeds in making christians worthless servants through fear of their family coming to want. A few years since, what was called the *widow's fund* was in great repute in some churches. Hundreds of dollars which might have been well employed in the instruction of their families, and in promoting the cause of the Redeemer, were deposited in that fund to save their families from dependence.—It is worthy of remark that this institution was most popular when professors were doing nothing but providing for themselves. It is questionable whether any widow or orphan ever was the better for such an institution. God's plan is, attend diligently to the master's work till the term of service expires, and thus you will leave your wife and children rich in claims on the bank of heaven. "Leave thy fatherless

children, I will preserve them alive; and let thy widows trust in me." Jer. 49—11. And the whole history of God's providence attests his faithfulness. An instance of the widow and children of a pious servant of God coming to want and suffering, never has been seen. Many hundred years after God proclaimed from Mount Sinai that when the servant is dismissed, the master shall take care of his family, David was directed to record his testimony to the divine faithfulness: "I have been young and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken nor his seed begging bread." Ps. 37.—24. We have seen pious widows and their families poor and afflicted. We have seen them reduced to a temporary dependence on friends. But no man ever saw them forsaken, or compelled to beg their bread from door to door. We read (2. Kings 4, 2.) of a widow, in the days of Ahab and Jezebel, whose situation seemed desperate. Her husband, a prophet, too pious to desert his master's work to secure a fortune for his family, had died insolvent. Under laws framed by men whose tender mercies were cruel, the creditor had come to seize her fatherless children to make them bond-men. But just at the moment when a sneering infidel might be ready to say—"where is the God of the widow and fatherless?"—the prophet Elisha arrives to relieve her by miracle. When Elijah reached the gate of Zarephath in a time of famine, he met a pious and poor widow who had come out to gather a few sticks to bake the last handful of meal in her house, that she and her only child might eat, and lie down and die. But Elijah's very business was to release that poor widow. True, we may not in these times expect miracles. But the God of the widow and fatherless has other ways of taking care of the families of his servants besides miracles.

The children, with the mother, shall be the master's. They are not his servants. Perhaps they never will be. They are simply the children of his servants.

God's covenant secures to the children of his servants the means of salvation. Hence they were to be circumcised on the eighth day.—We are told that this rite was *a seal of the righteousness of faith*; and that its advantages were *much every way; chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.* Rom. 2.—3. The Apostle Peter assures us that these privileges are still continued to the children of God's servants. Rom. 2—38, 39. The Apostle Paul in deciding a question about which the Corinthians had written to him, (11 Cor. 7, 13,) teaches that children of a believing father or mother *are holy*.—And the term *holy* like all the technical terms of the new testament must be interpreted by reference to the law of Moses.

The blessings which parents secure for their children by becoming servants of God, is a subject too much neglected. It is the doctrine of God's word, confirmed by his providence, that there is more probability of their salvation than of others. Examine the register of any church twenty years old, and you will find that a large proportion of the members were the children of God's servants. Generally the proportion is as ten to one; frequently as ninety-nine to a hundred. It is as true of them as of any others, *he that believeth not shall be damned.* But the God of their fathers will not let them go easily to hell.

He will pursue them long, with the calls of the gospel, with chastisements, and the strivings of his spirit.

The manner in which he followed the ten tribes of Israel, for centuries, through all their wanderings, and their high-handed wickedness, is worthy of particular notice. When those tribes with Jeroboam the son of Nebat at their head, set up their golden calves, and built their rebel altar, and thus openly renounced the Saviour typified by the altar at Jerusalem, he would not let them go. After warning them (1. Kings 13.) that God would kindle the fire of hell on those who served and trusted in any Saviour typified by their altar, he resorted to a course of chastisement like that which brought the prodigal son to say: "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him: Father I have sinned against heaven and before thee." He withdraws the restraints of his providence, and for a while, gives them up to their wickedness. In the mean time he warns Jeroboam and Israel that he was about to inflict judgment which would show all future generations, that no common wrath awaits the ringleaders in apostacy and schism. The prophet Ahijah was commanded to deliver this message: "I will bring evil upon the house of Jeroboam, and will cut off from Jeroboam every male, and him that is shut up and left in Israel, and will take away the remnant of the house of Jeroboam as a man taketh away dung till it be all gone. Him that dieth of Jeroboam, in the city, shall the dogs eat; and him that dieth in the field shall the fowls of the air eat; for the Lord hath spoken it." But one event must first take place. Jeroboam had a son, a youth *in whom was found some good thing toward the Lord God of Israel*. Such was his general character for amiableness; and so high were the hopes of his future usefulness, that when he died, *all Israel mourned for him*. That young man must first come to his grave in peace; and till then God would spare his father's house. But soon after the death of young Abijah, a scene commenced which has no parallel in modern times; unless we except the reign of atheism in France. In about twenty seven years from the death of Jeroboam they had seven kings. Nearly all of them died violent deaths; and most of them were devoured by dogs. One, in a fit of desperation, commits suicide by burning his palace over his head. Another is slain by his servants while drinking himself drunk in the house of his steward. A third is assassinated in camp at the siege of Gibbethon. And generally before the uproar and confusion have subsided the dogs have devoured the dead body.—'Through all the variety of dispensations of judgment and mercy, they frequently enjoyed the ministrations of such men as Ahijah, and Jehu the son of Hanani and Elijah, and Elisha. And though they refused to return, God continued for centuries to assert his claim on them as the children of his servants. Nearly all his messages to them are prefaced with: *thus saith the Lord God of Israel*. And even when the Son of God was about to ascend to his father, he remembered those rebellious children of the covenant; and charged his disciples to go and preach to them the remission of sins, before they went to the Gentiles,

The same principle is illustrated in the history of Benjamin and

Judah. They killed the prophets, and stoned those that were sent unto them. They crucified the Lord of glory, and insulted him while hanging on the cross, by making sport of his power to save them. But the Saviour prayed for their forgiveness; and afterwards charged his disciples to preach the gospel to them before any others. The apostle Peter thus assigns the reason—"ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham: And in thy seed shall all the kingdoms of the earth be blessed. Unto you first, God having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Acts 3. 25, 26.

Let no one, however, deceive himself by trusting in his relation to any of God's servants for the salvation of his soul. *We have Abraham for our father*—is recorded as the hope of hypocrites. It was a child of the covenant who lifted up his eyes in torment *and saw Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom*. He calls Abraham *father*, and the patriarch owns the kindred by calling him his son. And although for the sake of their fathers, and his own covenant he would not give up the unbelieving Jews when they had betrayed and murdered the Messiah: Yet when they took their stand between the Saviour and perishing sinners, and forbade the Apostles to preach to the Gentiles he did give them up, *and wrath came upon them to the uttermost*. 1. Thess. 2—16. Woe to that land where teaching any class of sinners to read the bible, and assembling them to hear the gospel preached, is made a crime to be punished at the whipping post, or in prison, or in the penitentiary, or on the gallows. The man who supposes that God will not visit for that sin, is grossly ignorant of the scriptures, or he is an infidel. That minister of the gospel who can take his stand between the enslaved Africans and the fountain of life to keep them off by preventing them from reading or hearing the gospel, or teach others to do so; that minister, with all his profane and nonsensical apologies, is a scandal to his office. He is bantering the Almighty; and one of two things is just as certain as that there is a God who has promised to execute judgment for the oppressed. He will repent and put away his wickedness; *or fear shall come upon him as a desolation, and destruction as a whirlwind*. The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

In the close of this statute provision is made to render the painful separation of a Hebrew man from his wife and children unnecessary. This is what might be expected from a statute framed in heaven. The law of God given by Moses, and the slave laws of our land are, in this and many other respects, just as opposite, and as wide asunder as heaven and hell. It seems, the servants relation to his master ceased with the expiration of the sixth year. Of course he may form a new connexion; but it must be of a different kind. He is not in debt, nor pinched with poverty. He has just received a liberal supply of corn, and wine, and cattle. He cannot become a type of the poor servant of Jesus. But he may by an extraordinary process, become a type of that glorious servant *who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant*, for the sake of his bride, his wife, as

his church is called. In allusion to the fact that the love of Christ for his church was typified by the love of the Hebrew servant for his wife and children, the love of the Saviour, and the love of husbands are often noticed in the New Testament as parallels. "Husbands love your wives even as Christ also loved the church, &c."

"If the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children, I will not go out free; then shall his master bring him unto the judges."^{*}

It must be plainly said, and clearly understood that he was not forced by necessity; but influenced by motives similar to those of the son of God when he became a servant—love of his father, and his church.—But why must he be brought before the judges? Not to prevent the taking advantage of a poor man. That was not necessary in the first instance when the parties were comparative strangers. And surely it is less necessary now, when after an experience of six years he has found that his late master is a good man, and *that it was well with him in his house*. We repeat it, this extraordinary procedure was typical of the extraordinary manner in which Jesus was subjected to the law as a servant for our sakes.

"His master shall bring him to the judges, he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post, and thrust his ear through with an awl."

We here notice as an illustration of the slave holding spirit, the use made of this passage in a late zealous defence of slavery. The writer appeals to this statute with apparent triumph for proof that the Hebrews were allowed to make slaves of their brethren. "Yes (said he) the Lord directed them to bring up their slaves to the door post and in presence of the magistrates, mark them in the ear with an awl, just as we mark our cattle." The horrible assumption is that when God gave forth this statute from Mount Sinai, his ultimate object was to assist slave holders in making beasts of their children! The truth is, the slave holding spirit is the spirit of a devil. It can trample under foot the rights of the poor, and trade even in the bodies and souls of the redeemed: and with a fiendish recklessness, tell the young and the ignorant, that the typical ordinances of the Old Testament were divine licenses to live in high handed wickedness.

To understand the direction here given, we must recollect that the Hebrews were required to write the law on their gates and on the door posts of their houses. When a stranger arrived at the premises of an Israelite, the first thing which met his eye was the law given at Sinai written on the gate. Thus he was warned that the inhabitants feared the God of Abraham; that all who set their feet within that gate must

* We must interpret the law of Moses as we interpret every statute book. To ascertain the law in any case, we must bring into view the original enactment, and all the subsequent additions or supplements. Exodus 21 taken separately, would cut off the servant from his liberal supply of corn and wine and cattle. Deut. 15 viewed alone, gives an imperfect view of the servants plea for having his ear bored. But taking both into view it seems he had three inducements—love of his master, of his wife, and of his children.

reverence his law; and that no one who indulged in the violation of it could be entertained there. When he reached the house he saw on the door post, the same law as the rule for the heads of the family, for their sons and daughters, their man servants and maid servants and the stranger within their gates. The servant was to be brought up to the door or to the post on which the law was written, and his ear laid to that post, and bored through with an awl. Thus in an extraordinary manner he was subjected to that law as a servant in that house.

That we are not mistaken in viewing this transaction as typical of Jesus subjecting himself to the law as a servant in his fathers house, for the redemption of his church; is evident from the allusion to it, Ps. 40—6. "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ear thou hast opened." Or as we have it in the old version of the Psalms of David, "mine ear thou hast bored." It is admitted that David uses a different word from that which Moses here employs. But it is also true that Moses himself adopts a different one when he repeats this statute, Deut. 15. And it is equally true that Paul [Heb. 10: 5] when he quotes the psalmist, uses a phraseology different from them both. He says: *a body has thou prepared me.* We are told that the Apostle here follows the Septuagint. And some writers with their usual recklessness add, that the Apostles, to show the respect due to existing translations, often quote the Septuagint when it expresses ideas entirely different from those of the original. That is, they quote the old testament by not quoting it all; and they do so, to show how much we should respect bad translations. It is true, they often do not confine themselves to the words of the old Testament in their quotations. But they never follow the Septuagint excepting when it gives the spirit and sum of the original text, so far as they wish to quote it. But what is meant by God's preparing the body or human nature of his son? This question is answered Gal. 44, "he was made under the law." The law which his church was under had no claims on him. As God, he was the author of it; and his human nature alone was not his person. His situation was typified by that of the Hebrew whose wife was under a law having no claims on him as a servant in the seventh year. Jesus, that he might redeem his Church, was *made under the law*; put under it by an extraordinary constitution, typified by boring the Hebrew's ear.

*And he shall serve him forever.**—All but Universalists admit that *forever* is a definite term; and all who are acquainted with the bible know that it sometimes means duration strictly *eternal*, and sometimes defined portions of time. It always means *throughout the term*; and what that term is, must be ascertained from the connexion. It is used

* We have seen the old Bible, which appeared to have been, originally, the property of the great-grand-father, taken down from the high shelf to settle the dispute about slave holding, by reading—and *he shall serve him forever.* "Yes God Almighty allows me to hold my slaves forever, and that is long enough for me." And then after some warm encomiums on the privileges of *that old dispensation*, the good book was put back on the same high shelf, to be taken down again, should a similar occasion ever make it necessary.

to express the duration of God's existence, of the misery of the wicked, of the happiness of the righteous, the whole of the Mosaic dispensation, and that under which Melchizedeck ministered. It will not be pretended that either of these is its meaning in the statute before us. It cannot mean *until the jubilee*. The jubilee is not here named; nor is there any allusion made to it in the context. It cannot mean *for life*. Such an interpretation would make the law defeat its own design. The object in subjecting the Hebrew, by boring his ear was to prevent separation from his wife. To make him a servant for life while she in a few years will be free, would increase the difficulty. Such a blunder would disgrace the most ignorant legislative body on earth.—But we must remember that this statute was framed by infinite wisdom. *Forever*, in this place, means neither more nor less than throughout the term of years which created the difficulty, or which remain, of the wife's servitude. At farthest it cannot be a longer term than that of the Saviour's public ministry.

From this brief analysis of the statute before us, the following particulars are obvious. The master and servant were originally related to each other as elder and younger brethren. They were types of Jesus Christ our elder brother, and his servants. The kindness of the elder in delivering a younger brother from thralldom by the payment of a sum of money, and taking him into his household, and protecting and feeding and clothing him till the seventh year, prefigured the love of Jesus in giving his life a ransom for sinners, and all that gracious work by which he saves and fits them for heaven. The sale on the part of the servant was voluntary, and the term of service limited.—His going out free for nothing in the seventh year, and the liberal supply which he received from his master, exhibited to the church and the world, the terms on which all the servants of Jesus Christ are admitted to rest in heaven, when dismissed from the master's work on earth, and the nature of the reward he will bestow. The care manifested in this typical statute to prevent the master from being defrauded of the services of any of his servants before the year of freedom, illustrates the paramount claims of our master in heaven. The hold which it gives a female servant or her master for protection & food & raiment, when her husband is released before her, presents a cheering view of the claims of all pious widows on their own God and the God of their husbands. And the privileges of all children of the covenant are strikingly exhibited in the care which the master was bound to exercise over the children of the deceased servant until their relation to him was dissolved by the freedom of their mother. The love of the servant to his master, and his wife and children, expressed by putting himself under the law by which they were bound until their release, pointed to the love which that glorious servant the son of God should in due time manifest to his father and his church, by voluntarily putting himself under the law for her redemption. The extraordinary ceremony of boring the servant's ear intimated that the law which the church was under had naturally no claims on God incarnate, and that he must be put under it by an extraordinary constitution. And unless the husband's becoming a servant the second time increased the difficulty which

it was intended to remove, it is manifest that the term **FOREVER** here means, neither more nor less, than the years which yet remained of his wife's term of service.

In conclusion; there are three inquiries which force themselves on the mind of every thinking man. Do our churches need cleansing from the defilement of the sin of slave holding? By what means are they to be cleansed? And by whom are these means to be used?

Let us decide these matters in the light of the law of Moses. All such enquiries are answered plainly and unequivocally by the law respecting dead bodies, which were the types of dead works. Numb. 19. A dead body in a tent defiled every person, and every uncovered vessel in that tent; a cleansing could be effected only by the water of separation, sprinkled with cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop; and this sprinkling could be done only by a clean person.

1. *Our churches are defiled by this sin, and they must be cleansed.*—That loathesome carcass, slaveholding, has been lying in the church for more than three hundred years. In the eyes of many it is a pest to the church's sacred furniture. There are hundreds and thousands of professed christians who will not permit it to be removed or disturbed. An attempt to sell the ark of the covenant would not have produced greater convulsions in Israel, than an attempt to remove slavery from some of our churches. Every person and every vessel is polluted.—Many of our members and ministers have grown grey in this sin.—Some of them have acquired splendid fortunes by buying and selling the members of the Saviour's mystical body. If our children in Sabbath schools and theological seminaries use some of the popular helps for understanding the word of God, they must believe that Abraham was a thief; that the Old Testament church was a den of licensed man-stealers; that many of the statutes given at Mount Sinai, instead of being the shadows of good things to come, were intended merely to encourage and regulate the slave trade; and that the traffic in bodies and souls, which the best and the worst men on earth execrate as sinful in principle and ruinous in its results, is a divine institution. Let no one say, the churches in our free states are clean. They are parts of a defiled house. And it is a fact, that the most corrupt and corrupting sentiments in relation to this subject are just as rife in our free states as in any part of the Union. It indicates an unthinking mind to say we have nothing to do with slavery. Admit that it is a christian duty to abandon two millions of Africans, and their descendants, to interminable oppression; admit that the religion of Jesus requires us to bid God speed to those who are forbidding them to read and hear the word of life, and are thus killing their souls to facilitate the work of enslaving their bodies; still we ourselves have souls, and our children and neighbors have souls, and the soul-destroying leprosy is in our churches; and the question whether they shall be cleansed or not is a question of life and death.

2. *The word of God is the great means to be used in cleansing our churches.*—It is in vain to think of persuading a slaveholder to abandon his iniquity, by talking to him of its cruelties, so long as you admit that it is authorised by the Bible. A sheriff may be as merciful and de-

vout while hanging the murderer by the neck till he is dead, as the man who is weeping at a distance through the whole scene. He will consider all that you can say about the cruelty of taking away life as out of place, so long as he believes that it is the law of God and his country: "He that sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." The world would have abandoned the sin of slaveholding long ago, had not the churches stepped forward and, with the Bible in their hands, clamorously asserted that it is a divine institution. The man who, by a noise about cruelty, endeavors to enlist public feeling against any thing which God has clearly instituted or commanded, is beating up rebellion against his Maker. If any part of the word authorises involuntary, hereditary and perpetual servitude, slaveholders are doing their duty, and emancipators ought to be suspended from the communion of the church. It is lawful to employ every good argument on this subject; but the word of God must be brought to bear on men's consciences. His own word is the sceptre which the Almighty sways over our fallen world, and the great means by which he keeps it in order; and those who fancy themselves infidels are more under its controlling influence than they are aware, or willing to admit.

As christians, it is unseemly ever to think of cleansing our churches without the word of God. By cleansing a church polluted with slavery, we do not mean driving away the hated Africans, or persuading men to abandon an unprofitable sin. By cleansing our churches we mean putting away the sin of oppression, and obtaining forgiveness from God through the application of the blood of Jesus, and cleansing from defilement by the sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost. Any thing short of this will leave our church an unclean house. And yet there are men, and even christian ministers who denounce, as fanatics and incendiaries, all who insist on any thing more than the removal of the Africans. Slaveholders and their apologists are the only professors of the christian religion on earth who openly avow the damnable heresy, that it is enough to cease from the practice of sin, and, in any case, imprudent to urge sinners to flee to the high priest for cleansing. According to their maxim, when a horse thief draws back from stealing because he sees the eye of a witness upon him, he is converted, and needs neither pardon nor sanctification to fit him for heaven. That minister of the gospel who intentionally and deliberately shuns to declare to his people that every known sin must be abandoned, and that, for every transgression, they must seek pardon through the blood of atonement, and sanctification by the Spirit of God, or lose their souls; that minister, whether he means so or not, is acting the part of a traitor towards God, and a murderer of the souls committed to his care.

The word of God, that humble, yet excellent and powerful means of cleansing from sin, was symbolized under the law, by a bunch of hyssop tied to a stem of cedar by scarlet wool. That was the only instrument to be used in sprinkling atoning blood and the water of separation on the unclean. Our Lord (John xvii. 17) does not pray for the sanctification of believers in any other way than through the instrumen-

tality of the word; and surely that is the means which God will bless.*

3. *By whom are the means to be used for cleansing our churches from the guilt and defilement of the sin of Slavery?* We answer those especially whose hands are clean, or have been cleansed; and we add that in the free states is the place to preach against this sin. We are often told—go the South and preach against slavery. Sometimes this is malignant banter. “Go the South, where my brother, the slaveholder can hear you, and he will take your life.” But if the scenes which lately disgraced some of our Atlantic states, be tests of the spirit of the North, it would be cowardice to flee to the South. It is in the free states that a minister of the gospel must put his life in his hands if he dares to save his soul by telling his hearers that *man stealing* †

* The apostle Paul (1 Cor. i. 23, 24) notices three distinguishing features of that word of God which the Holy Spirit uses in applying the Saviour's blood: *it is humble* (foolishness to the world;) *it is the wisdom of God*; and *it is the power of God*. We shall, perhaps, provoke the reader's pity when we say that these three characteristics were symbolized by the hyssop, and cedar, and scarlet wool used in sprinkling the typical blood. “Solomon spake of trees from the cedar that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall.” Among the sublime objects in the Holy Land were those tall cedars on the top of Lebanon, hiding their heads in the heavens. Hence we hear of the “height of the cedars,” and of the “goodly cedars.” The church, in describing her Saviour, says—“his countenance is excellent as the cedars.” The hyssop was humble—it would grow any where, even out of the wall.—But, notwithstanding its apparant meanness, it was most sweetly fragrant, and possessed many medicinal properties. Of scarlet wool were made the robes worn by kings, as the emblem of power. Hence a mop of hyssop tied to a stem of cedar with scarlet wool was a suitable emblem of the humble, yet sublime and powerful, word of God.

Perhaps this note will only furnish employment for those expositors who are too polite to laugh when Jesus Christ and his apostles speak of Moses as a shadow of good things to come; yet find it convenient to soothe their vanity, and excuse their ignorance by sneering at all attempts to find either wisdom or meaning in any thing which they themselves do not understand.

Perhaps some of the advocates of slavery, as has been threatened, will undertake to put down abolition, by proving that this interpretation is fanciful; or that Dickey, in his review, was wrong in saying the oldest son was lord of the soil. We should be pleased to see the attempt made. It would have, at least, as much bearing on the question of slavery as pulling down churches. But we advise them to take care. A mischievous boy once succeeded in robbing an orchard by laying in the dog's way a crooked horn filled with butter.

† We have conversed with more than one theologian who, though compelled to acknowledge that seizing the person of a neighbor and compelling him to labor for us without wages, is the sin which the bible calls man-stealing, yet insist that it is imprudent to say so!! Such squeamishness about calling things by their right names reminds us, of a congregation who threatened their pastor with a withdrawal of the stipend, unless he ceased to call them sinners. Accordingly he agreed to adopt the phrase, “Ladies and Gentlemen.” The result was they never quarrelled. How could they! The people continued to pay the stipend, and the preacher continued to be a mere appendage to society for its amusement on the sabbath day.

is a sin against God. Preaching to slave holders is nearly a hopeless business. Our grandfathers preached to drunkards all their lives, and many of them on their death beds had not the satisfaction of knowing that they had ever been instrumental in the reformation of a single drunkard. At length their children thought of preaching to the temperate, and of persuading them to combine their testimony against the common use of ardent spirits. The result all Christendom knows.—If slave holders are ever brought to blush for the sin of oppression, it will be by the united remonstrance of those who can lift up clean hands.

None but a clean person could use the water and hyssop so as to cleanse a defiled person or house. Numb. 19, 18. It is not only the doctrine of the Bible but a dictate of plain common sense, that no man can impart to his neighbor principles purer than those which he possesses himself. How long would it take grocers and distillers to preach our churches into strict temperance? It is an evidence of the stultifying influence of the slave holding spirit that there is a great outcry, among slave holders, against the inhabitants of the free States for meddling with the sin of slavery. This is perhaps the only subject they wish to monopolize; and the reason is obvious—they could manage it to their own pleasing. And how long would it take them to preach that the sin in question was practised by Abraham and the primitive Christians, legalised by Moses, and worked at by our Lord and his Apostles, before these people will repent and cry for mercy? A slave-holding Minister preaching against slavery is solemn mockery.

Finally—*this typical institution contains glad tidings for all who are perishing in sin.* Are there any present who feel that they are poor, deeply in debt to the law of God, and in themselves helpless and hopeless? An inspired Apostle with his eye fixed on the law of typical servitude, declares (Rom. 14—9.) that Jesus *both died, and rose, and revived that he might be the master (Lord,) both of the dead and the living* i. e. that he might do for them all that was typified of old by the office of a master—that he might pay off all their debts, and do for them all that is needful till they are finally admitted to the enjoyment of rest in heaven. In allusion to this statute he himself invites sinners to seek their salvation in him and thus states the terms:—*If any man serve me, let him follow me, and where I am, there shall my servant be; if any man serve me, him will my father honor.* John 12,—26.